

REMARKS

Pursuant to the Election Restriction dated January 11, 2005, Applicant elected by Election dated January 13, 2005 to pursue the Claims of Group I, Species I, namely Claims 1-12 with traverse. The above Compliant Amendment transmits herewith a complete set of claims with appropriate status identifiers.

Applicant has amended Claim 12 to eliminate the indefinite part of this claim by canceling the “whereby” clause. Reconsideration of this ground of rejection is therefore requested.

Claims 1-3 and 10 are rejected as being anticipated by the Gelin patent, whereas the remainder of the claims are rejected over Gelin in view of a number of other patents.

At the outset it will be seen that what Applicant is claiming is a localized meander line structure interposed in a straight elongated element. Nowhere is this shown or taught in any of the references of record.

The principal reference, the Gelin reference, shows a zigzag trace on a plane that is distributed over the entire length of the antenna.

On the other hand, as claimed, the meander line is localized and is interposed somewhere along an elongated straight conductive element.

As a result, the localized meander line blocks the higher frequency signals from passing it and therefore acts as a choke. The placement of the meander line is thus important to be able to tune to the higher frequency signals, thus eliminating those portions of the straight conductive element away from the feed point at the top of the cone.

As to the lower frequencies, the localized meander line acts as a loading inductor.


These two actions extend the bandwidth of the discone antenna in a way not contemplated by Gelin or any of the other references in combination with Gelin.

In point of fact, the Gelin structure cannot operate in this fashion because, first and foremost, the zigzag is distributed over the entire length of the antenna; second, because it cannot function as a choke at higher frequencies; and thirdly, because it cannot function as a loading inductor to any other portion of the antenna, much less any straight portion, which it does not have.

In view of this Amendment it is Applicant's contention that the 35 USC 102 rejection will not lie and that no combination of references with Gelin teaches the claimed invention. This requires removal of the 35 USC 103 rejection.

Allowance of the claims and issuance of the case is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert K. Tandler
Reg. No.: 24,581
65 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02110
Tel: (617) 723-7268

Date:

May 24, 2005